



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant argued that the prior art (US'471) does not teach the limitation of allowing the flow in the direction of the moving hearth in the cooling step as recited in the method claims 1 and 16. The prior art does not teach the limitation of maintaining a high pressure in melting steps as recited in the instant method claims 2 and 16. In response, the Examiner's position is US'471 teaches the similar partitions and arrangement as recited in the instant invention and the controlling the pressure and flow direction are functions of the partitions. No Agreement was reached. A possible amendments for the instant claims have been discussed.